THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI FEBRUARY, 1953 No. 392

Editorial

WE cannot claim to have read every word of Dr Lowther Clarke's *Concise Bible Commentary* (S.P.C.K., 30s.). But the more we have read the more evident has it become that it is likely to be accepted at once as the best existing one-volume commentary, and rightly so. Dr Lowther Clarke, by writing it, and S.P.C.K. by the form and price of its publication, have done a great service to the Church, to students of theology, and to all serious readers of the Bible. It is a happy circumstance that he possessed not only the learning and insight but also the inflexible industry without which such a work could not have been carried through.

There are well-known one-volume commentaries on the Bible produced by teams of scholars, which have been able to draw upon resources that no one man can have at his disposal. On the other hand, it is not to be expected that all the members of a team will have an equal aptitude for this kind of composition and inevitably the results of their collaboration are uneven. Not only do their contributions vary in quality, but consistency of standpoint and method can be only approximately achieved by the most skilful editorial supervision. The work of a single author should be free from these drawbacks, and the present work is triumphantly free from them. At the same time, its evenness and consistency are not the fruit of rigid assumptions or of *idées fixes*. Dr Lowther Clarke does not belong to any one school either of Biblical criticism or of theological interpretation. He has the rare gift of assimilating what all have to give and, where they contradict one another, of holding a balance between them, yet without falling into a lifeless *juste-milieu*. The interest of his work never flags, because his own interest in it seems always fresh.

The volume contains five sections. Section One (pp. 1–333) consists of twenty-nine special articles, and it is convenient that they should be grouped together instead of being sandwiched in at various stages in the volume. These articles deal with all the introductory and background topics that one would expect to find covered as well as some, e.g. "The Bible View of History", which it is a pleasant surprise to find included. Section Two (pp. 334–628), Section Three (pp. 629–84), and Section Four (pp. 685–951), consist of the commentaries on each of the separate books of the Old Testament, of the Apocrypha, and of the New Testament respectively. Section Five (pp. 954–87) contains a very useful "Glossary of Bible Words", some outline courses of Bible study, and a note on "Extra-canonical Literature".

The author has deliberately, and no doubt wisely, refrained from citing the names of other scholars, except in a brief but comprehensive article on the history of the "Critical Study of the Bible" (pp. 316–24). There, however, he has occasion to mention F. C. Burkitt's "lucidity and critical flair". Dr Lowther Clarke's own writing is certainly marked by precisely those characteristics, as readers of THEOLOGY have had many opportunities of discovering during the past thirty years. This commentary fully deserves to be called *Concise*: but it is not concise in the sense of being dry or impersonal. The evasiveness of deep, dark, and difficult questions which some Biblical commentators appear to have cultivated, and which would not be without excuse in a one-volume commentary, is notably absent here. Whoever uses this volume will find not only that his understanding of the Bible is enlightened and enriched but also that his awareness of the range and complexity of theological problems is extended.

The only obvious deficiency of this Commentary, in comparison with Peake's or Gore's, lies in the complete absence of bibliographies. Its usefulness will be substantially increased if in future editions Dr Lowther Clarke is able to add to each article and to each separate commentary information about one or two books for further and more detailed study. That is to say, we should wish to see no more than select bibliographies. Dr Lowther Clarke has so wide an acquaintance with the literature of Bible study and his assessments are so judicious that his selection of the one or two best books on each subject would command unusual confidence.

The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry of our Lord

THIS article was prompted by two things. (*a*) A review[1] by Dr Alan Richardson of *The Fulness of Christ*[2] in which he made two chief criticisms, first that the report claimed to be a statement of the evangelical view but that it was really only Anglicanism, and secondly that it was weak on Eucharistic sacrifice. It "does scant justice to the sacrificial language in which the New Testament abounds". "Nor may we suppose that a Church which thought of itself as a royal priesthood would be likely to have no doctrine of a priestly offering at its great weekly passover festival of the Eucharist." Evangelicals, he suggests, can help combat wrong ideas of Eucharistic sacrifice by developing positive Biblical concepts. (*b*) The reading of two books claiming to point to an evangelical doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, viz. *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*, by J. E. Rattenbury, and *The Lord's Supper in Early Methodism*, by J. C. Bowmer.

The doctrine of the Wesleys' hymns is that our Lord, once slain on the Cross, entered the heavenly sanctuary where he presents,

[1] *The Churchman*, June 1951.

[2] A report presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Archdeacon of Sheffield and others.

pleads, offers his sacrifice on our behalf. In the Eucharist the Church on earth joins our Lord in that same activity, so that our prayer is

> Turn from me thy glorious eyes
> To that bloody sacrifice,
> To the tokens of his death
> Here exhibited beneath.[1]

Much Scriptural backing is claimed for this theory. First, there are two phrases from the narratives of the institution of the Eucharist. (*a*) *ἀνάμνησις* is interpreted as a sacrificial memorial before God. "When they use the word memorial they think of Jesus as the slaughtered lamb who is also the Great High Priest eternally living and pleading by his wounds and suffering."[2] What are the facts? There was a well-known O.T. institution by which a meal offering, which could not easily be burned and go up to God, had incense added to it which was burned and went up to God to be a memorial (Heb. *azkarah*) of the offering itself. This word *azkarah* is translated *μνημόσυνον*, i.e. that which recalls—never *ἀνάμνησις*, the act of recalling. *Ἀνάμνησις* is not once used in the LXX in connexion with a sacrifice. There is one apparent exception to this in Lev. 24. 7, where the M.T. has *azkarah* and the LXX *ἀνάμνησις*. But the whole passage in the LXX is mistranslated and differs widely from the M.T. The latter reads: "It [i.e. incense] shall be to the bread for a memorial." The LXX translated "they shall serve as bread for . . ." It would then be impossible to continue *μνημόσυνον;* for the bread was not burnt and could not be an *azkarah*. So the best the translator could do was to continue *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, for an act of remembrance or recalling. So far from proving that *ἀνάμνησις* equals *azkarah* and is synonymous with *μνημόσυνον*, this passage proves exactly the contrary. It was put in only because the bread could not be an *azkarah*. It is a matter of some interest that the early liturgies did not so understand it. Bishop Gore, discussing the interpretation "memorial before God", pointed out[3] that "it was not apparently so understood by the Christian church. The phrase of the anaphora 'Therefore we remembering thy blessed passion', etc. *(μεμνημένοι οὖν)*, implies that they understood our Lord's words to mean, 'This do to remember me.'" Much liturgical water has flowed under the bridges since then, but is there anything which overturns this conclusion?

The account of Hebrew psychology in Pedersen's *Israel*[4] has lifted the discussion on to a new plane. For it is now clear that remembrance is more than a mere mental act. It is rather a dynamic activity by which the thing remembered gets to work. It is recalled so that it is here and now operative by its effects. This interpretation has been popularized by Dom Gregory Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy*, where, however, it is suggested that it is God to whom the work of Christ is recalled.[5] This is done by means of the book's unfortunate way of inserting in the texts quoted the author's parenthetical but

[1] Wesley's *Hymns on the Lord's Supper*, No. 119.
[2] Rattenbury, op. cit., p. 104.
[3] *The Body of Christ*[2], pp. 318–19.
[4] I-II, pp. 106–8, 245–59.
[5] Op. cit., p. 161.

quite unjustified explanations. There is however nothing in Pedersen's much fuller discussion of remembrance to suggest that it must be a calling to God's remembrance or that memory is dynamic only when God remembers. The book further confuses the issue by suggesting that, while the matter is clear in Greek, the idea was lost with the translation into Latin,[1] whereas of course the dynamic idea is Semitic and equally foreign both to Greek and Latin ways of thought. Separated from the mistaken idea that a Godward reference is implied in the word, this dynamic interpretation of *anamnesis* in relation to the Eucharist is very illuminating. "Do this in remembrance of me" can now be seen to mean that as we "eat this bread and drink this cup" our Lord's sacrifice becomes here and now operative in our lives.

(*b*) Καταγγέλλετε, "Ye do shew [R.V. proclaim] the Lord's death",[2] is interpreted as meaning "show to God".

> Him in a Memorial show
> Offer up the lamb to God.[3]

But the word is commonly used in the Acts and Pauline Epistles (seventeen times) for the proclamation of the Gospel before men. It is never used in the New Testament in any other sense. Indeed its structure forbids any other, as the prefix κατὰ means "down". Καταγγέλλω therefore can no more mean show up to God than a cataract can mean a fountain, or a catacomb a skyscraper. A number of liturgies paraphrase this sentence in some such language as "as oft as ye do these things, ye preach my death, announce my resurrection, hope for my advent".

The main support of the Wesleys' view has been found in the Hebrews, which is interpreted to mean that our Lord died once for all on the Cross, but that his blood or life then released is now being presented or offered to the Father. This view has now been made even more attractive by the currency of the theory that O.T. sacrifice was not centred in the infliction of death but in the offering of life. But while the writer to the Hebrews had many advantages, the opportunity of reading Robertson Smith *On the Religion of the Semites* was not amongst them, and he clearly connected sacrifice with death. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often . . . else must he often have suffered."[4] To him the offering was the suffering. This rules out the idea of continuous offering. "Who needeth not daily like those High Priests to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people. For this he did once for all when he offered up himself."[5] Elsewhere the point is made that while the Jewish High Priest entered the sanctuary with blood, i.e. to do something with it, our Lord entered *through* blood, i.e. on the basis of what had been done with it. Contrast 9. 7, "But into the second the High Priest alone once in the year, not without blood . . ." with 9. 11–12, "Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come . . . through his own blood entered in once for all

[1] Op. cit., p. 245. [2] 1 Cor. 11. 26. [3] H.L.S., No. 118.
[4] Heb. 9. 25. [5] Heb. 7. 25.

into the holy place *having obtained* eternal redemption." Notice that the writer holds that our Lord had obtained redemption for us before he entered into the heavenly sanctuary. In other words, his sacrifice was offered and accepted on the Cross. His Resurrection is said to be "in the blood", i.e. in the power of the blood "of the everlasting Covenant".[1] Moreover, if this theory were right the writer to the Hebrews would have written, "How much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal spirit *offers* himself without blemish unto God cleanse your conscience." Actually, of course, the tense is aorist, "He offered himself."[2]

The objection that our Lord is never referred to in the Hebrews as standing in position of a priest offering sacrifice is said to be hypercritical. "Anyone who reads Hebrews can hardly be surprised that the priest should be pictured by Wesley as standing."[3] It would indeed be hypercritical to stress the session of our Lord more than Hebrews does. But the idea has already been introduced several times[4] before ch. 10, and there it is not a passing reference where standing would have done just as well as sitting. But there is an explicit contrast between standing which represents continued offering, and sitting which represents an atoning work completed. "We have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering often times the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: But he when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet."[5]

The same kind of idea is also thought to be implied by the picture in the Revelation of "the lamb standing as though it had been slain",[6] who is said to be standing in order to indicate the position of a priest ministering a sacrifice.

> Thou standest the ever slaughtered Lamb,
> Thy Priesthood still remains the same.[7]

But is it legitimate to assume without further question that because in the Hebrews standing when applied to a priest indicates the position of a priest offering, it must mean the same in the Apocalypse when applied to a victim? The meaning can be discovered only from its context. There are twenty-nine references to the Lamb in the Revelation. Apart from a few scattered references to the Lamb's book of life they mostly come in three groups. (*a*) In ch. 7 we have a vision of saints and martyrs who wash their robes in his blood. The Lamb is their shepherd and feeds them. (*b*) Chs. 12–14. The saints overcome by the blood of the Lamb who stands in the midst of his martyrs. (*c*) Chs. 19–22. The triumph of the Lamb and his marriage with the bride. So the function of the Lamb in general and the meaning of the symbol seem to be the application of sacrifice, and in every case its application is to the Church, not to God. But what about the phrase "the Lamb standing"? The same image is repeated in 14. 1 where the Lamb is seen standing with his martyrs, and it indicates his

[1] Heb. 13. 20. [2] Heb. 9. 13. [3] Rattenbury, op. cit., p. 107.
[4] 1. 3; 8. 1. [5] 10. 10–12. [6] 5. 6. [7] H.L.S. No. 5.

active concern for them just as Stephen saw "the Son of Man standing"[1] to receive his first martyr. Now we are in a position to examine 5. 6. The situation in that passage is that the book of destiny is close sealed in the hand of him that sits on the throne. None can open it and this is a cause of bitter weeping. But also on the throne is the Lamb *ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*, as though it had been slain. The tense is perfect, indicating completeness. He has been slain and the results of that death are abiding. But now he is standing, i.e. restored to life, and so able to succour his people. This he does by coming and taking the book. One minor point to notice in support of this interpretation is that he is not standing before the throne as a priest, but in the midst of it.

Some would feel that the case for the idea of continual offering or an eternal sacrifice in the Revelation rests more on the phrase "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world".[2] The whole phrase in the R.V. runs "every one whose name hath not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world". There are two points to be made on this:

(*a*) It is almost certain that the phrase "from the foundation of the world" should be taken not with "lamb slain" but with "book written". For the phrase is repeated in 17. 8 in such a way that this is the only interpretation, "they whose name hath not been written in the book of life from the foundation of the world".[3] This interpretation is taken by Swete, Charles, Anderson Scott, Moffatt, Simcox, Kiddle, also by Peake's and Gore's Commentaries.

(*b*) Even if against this consensus the phrase is to be taken as in R.V. the sense is surely the same as in 1 Pet. 1. 18, "Ye were redeemed . . . with the precious blood as of a lamb . . . even the blood of Christ who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times"; i.e. it means that the Cross was no afterthought with God.

Some perhaps would agree that our Lord is not offering his sacrifice, but would maintain that the truth is that he is pleading it. They would probably quote such passages as "He ever liveth to make intercession for us"[4] and "Christ entered into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us".[5] In English we can speak of a lawyer appearing in a court to plead for his client. But the Greek word *ἐμφανισθῆναι* contains no such idea, but means rather to be fully visible. There is an implicit contrast with the High Priest who could enter the holy of holies only hidden in a cloud of incense, "that he die not".[6] Our Lord needs no such protection. He is fully manifest. In other words, he is in perfect communion with the Father into which we can enter.

But it may be asked, "What about our Lord's heavenly intercession? Surely that covers pleading his sacrifice, in some sense even

[1] Acts 7. 56. Cf. the Collect for St Stephen's Day, ". . . Jesus who standest at the right hand of God to succour all that suffer for thee." [2] Rev. 13. 8.
[3] This is a common Biblical idea, cf. Matt. 25. 34, "the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world". Eph. 1. 4, "chosen in him from the foundation of the world". [4] Heb. 7. 25. [5] Heb. 9. 24. [6] Lev. 16. 13.

offering it?" But we are not free to understand our Lord's intercession in any way we like that is at all compatible with the meaning of the English word. For "It is as King that Christ is also Priest, it is as seated on the Throne that he intercedes", not as standing a suppliant before the throne. "He of whom it is written 'He ever liveth to make intercession for us' said of himself 'I say not that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you.' The statements are mutually exclusive, if we allow ourselves to think of the Intercession as a ministry of supplication such as Christ exercised when he was on earth: but when we bring our thought of the Intercession into line with that of the Session as the right hand of God the difficulty disappears."[1]

"He ever liveth to make intercession for us."[2] What does this mean? Westcott *ad loc.* noted that the primary meaning of ἐντυγχάνειν in late Greek is "to meet with". "From this comes a secondary meaning, 'meeting with a person with a special object'." So the primary meaning of our text will be that our Lord is there for us; in other words, his union with the Father is the basis of ours. According to the thought of the Hebrews he is the pioneer who, having reached the goal, becomes the new and living way. Much light is thrown on our Lord's intercession by a passage where St Paul links the intercession of the Holy Spirit with that of the Son.[3] The former is manifested in the inarticulate groanings in the believer, and so is a reference to the Spirit's work in us in linking us to God. It would seem natural to assume that St Paul attaches the same meaning to the Son's intercession, as his references to both are so closely connected. This gives a meaning which fits very well in Heb. 7. Hence the assertion that "he is able to save to the uttermost seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession".

It should be noticed that the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, whom the writer to Hebrews at times takes as a type of Christ, did not plead the sacrifice in the holy of holies. He sprinkled the blood upon the mercy seat, etc., in order to purify them from the contagion they had incurred through the sinfulness of the surrounding people.[4] But, as Westcott taught,[5] there is no thought of pleading, but as a representative of the people the High Priest stood in the presence of God—the Atonement complete. "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven his Passion, 'offering his Blood' on behalf of men, has no foundation in the Epistle. His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of his accomplished work. He pleads as older writers truly expressed the thought by his Presence on his Father's throne."[6]

Perhaps the truth is that we ought to put a moratorium on the use of the word "plead" in this connexion; for it masks a fatal ambiguity. If I plead the sacrifice of Christ I may mean that my attitude to God is to point to the Cross and say, "Please do accept this sacrifice"; or

[1] A. J. Tait, *The Heavenly Session of our Lord*, Preface. [2] Heb. 7. 25.
[3] Rom. 8. 26–34. [4] Lev. 16. 16; 16. 19. [5] *Hebrews*, additional note on the present work of Christ as High-Priest. [6] Westcott, op. cit., p. 230.

that I point to the Cross and say, "That is why I come, not for any worthiness of my own." The latter is of course an essential element in the Christian's attitude to God, but the former is not, because it takes away from the sufficiency of the Cross of Christ. But our Lord cannot be said to plead his sacrifice in either sense. Indeed, according to the New Testament, is he doing anything with it except making it available for men? As Waterland said about the Eucharist, "Christ's sacrifice is our sacrifice . . . for us to partake of, not to offer unto God."[1]

Yet one cannot deny the force of Dr Richardson's point that the New Testament abounds in sacrificial language when speaking of the Godward life of the Christian. This covers both the Christian's general consecration to God[2] and particular aspects of the Christian life, e.g. faith,[3] almsgiving,[4] the conversion of the Gentiles,[5] martyrdom,[6] good works,[7] etc.

Moreover there is some evidence in the New Testament to suggest that while our Lord's atoning work is done, and the sin offering is completed, he does nevertheless offer something. So perhaps Wesley was right in linking our Eucharistic offering with our Lord's present work, though mistaken in his understanding of that work. I refer to such passages as "Christ also once hath suffered that he might bring us to God",[8] where the Greek is *ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ*, "that he might offer us to God", which is how the Vulgate translates the passage. Or "You hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death to present you *holy* and *without blemish* and unreprovable before him"[9] (sacrificial language in italics). Or again, "The angel [i.e. apparently our Lord] added incense unto the prayers of the saints upon the golden altar and the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, went up before God out of the angels' hands."[10] Lightfoot's comment is apt: "Christ is a priest for ever, still offering sacrifice to God but *no more himself*, but his people's sacrifice. And that offering is twofold, viz. the offering the persons of his people to God, as an acceptable living sacrifice (Is. 8. 18), and offering their services as an acceptable spiritual sacrifice to God (Rev. 8. 3)."[11]

Such an interpretation is confirmed by such passages as "Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of lips which make confession to his name",[12] or the description of Christians as "a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ".[13] This last phrase is sometimes interpreted to mean only "in consideration of him", i.e. of his atoning work. But this would require *διὰ* with the accusative, on account of, whereas here we have *διὰ* with genitive, meaning through, by means of. Waterland put the matter very clearly: "He is not the matter or subject of our sacrifices, but the mediator of them: we offer not him,

[1] *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1880 ed.), p. 548.
[2] Rom. 12. 1, 1 Pet. 2. 5. [3] Phil. 2. 17. [4] Phil. 4. 18.
[5] Rom. 15. 16. [6] 2 Tim. 4. 6. [7] Heb. 13. 16.
[8] 1 Pet. 3. 18. [9] Col. 1. 22. [10] Rev. 8. 3–4.
[11] Quoted by J. T. Tomlinson, *The Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 39. [12] Heb. 13. 15. [13] 1 Pet. 2. 5.

but we offer what we do offer by him."[1] Bishop Christopher Wordsworth put it even more tersely when he said, "He has everything to offer except himself."[2]

But why, it may be asked, should this offering attach itself to the Holy Communion? A recent article[3] admits the sacrificial language of the New Testament and draws the strange conclusion that we should find occasion of sacrifice everywhere except in the Holy Communion. But in the Holy Communion our Lord gives himself to his people, so that it is the focus and instrument of faith-union with Christ. For, as Jeremy Taylor has pointed out, "By whatsoever way Christ is taken out of the Sacrament, by the same he is taken in the Sacrament."[4] In faith-union receptivity is always the basic but not the only element. For there can be no appropriation without identification. A personal relationship is set up in which the believer is one with Christ. "Christ liveth in me" is indissolubly linked with "I am crucified with Christ."[5] In our measure we drink of the cup that he drank of. Therefore in receiving we must by that very fact and at the same time offer. There can be no communion without offering and, equally true, no offering without communion. The communion is the offering as well as the receiving. That is rooted in the very nature of the relationship between God and man established by our Lord. We can only offer through Christ, nor can we in any way add to, supplement, or renew his offering. It is his offering which renders ours acceptable—not we who join with him in praying that his may be acceptable.

When we analyse our offering further several points emerge.

(1) It is a corporate offering, an offering of the Church in its corporateness. Life redeemed is life redeemed from isolation and independence into the fellowship of the body of Christ. So the Church's offering of itself to God is more than the sum of the individual self-offerings of its members. In the Holy Communion it is most clearly shown that the way of receiving the benefits of our redemption is sharing them with our brethren. We who are many are clearly seen as one body because we partake of the one bread. By what we do, we confess that we cannot claim God as our Father without acknowledging our fellow Christians as our brethren. Since reception is a corporate as well as an individual act, then the offering must be so too. This is brought out in the 1549 Prayer Book, where our offering is linked with the prayer that the "partakers of this Holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction and made one body with thy Son, Jesus Christ". In our present Prayer Book, too, "there may be said to be two consecrations in the eucharistic action. There is the consecration of the elements to be received as the Body and Blood of the Lord, and there is a second consecration as Christ, when he is sacramentally received by the worshippers, renews their consecration as the Body of Christ."[6] In fact, where in the

[1] Op. cit., p. 338. [2] Quoted by Tomlinson, op. cit., p. 39.
[3] *The Churchman*, December 1951, by W. C. G. Proctor.
[4] Quoted by Oulton, *The Holy Communion and the Holy Spirit*, p. 164.
[5] Gal. 2. 20. [6] G. W. H. Lampe in *Ways of Worship*, p. 201.

Roman liturgy bread and wine are consecrated into the body and blood of Christ and offered to the Father, in ours through receiving the body and blood of Christ we are consecrated into the body of Christ and offered to God.

(2) It is a sacrifice of thanksgiving. "Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ to testify our duties unto God and to show ourselves thankful to him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise and thanksgiving."[1] Our sacrifice of praise cannot be confined to the Eucharist. It takes place "continually" whenever our "lips" or our lives "make confession to his name".[2] But it does find uniquely effective expression in the Eucharist. For deep things can often be expressed only in a significant action, and the Eucharist sets out in action that for which we have to be thankful. It sets it out primarily to us, as we have seen, but also before God. For the service is addressed to God, including of course the consecration prayer. If the reference of the service were exclusively manward it would be logical to use only the words of institution as a consecration formula without any prayer. This has actually been done by certain Lutheran and Reformed rites. The service is therefore our offering of thanksgiving. We offer not Christ but the whole action of the service, including the breaking of the bread and the receiving of the elements. As our service now stands the phrase "this our sacrifice" seems to refer back to the consecration, communion, and the Lord's Prayer, that immediately precede it, the dramatization of the mystery of our redemption culminating in our incorporation into the family of God. It expresses the Biblical insight that the best way to thank is to take. So we break and take before him and thankfully acknowledge our membership by grace in his Family.

(3) It is an exercise of our priesthood towards the material creation. "The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God."[3] Our bodies are part of the material creation. but they are the only part which can respond to the Creator and lift the rest to him. In the Holy Communion we take bread and wine and put them into God's hands. He links them with the Cross of Christ by consecration and returns them to us as means of grace. It is quite true "we cannot fitly speak of a large and wealthy congregation 'sacrificing' half a crown's worth of bread and wine".[4] But such a conception can arise only from an exclusive view of the sacraments. If we can see them as inclusive and representative, then we shall see in our offering of bread and wine on Sunday a pledge of our offering of our typewriters and tractors and all our material possessions on Mondays. Moreover we shall see in what God does to the one in Church the instrument by which he wills through us his priests to do the same to the other in his world.

W. M. F. Scott.

[1] Cranmer, *On the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society), p. 346.
[2] Heb. 13. 15. [3] Rom. 8. 19. [4] Tomlinson, op. cit., p. 45.

Great Pastors—II. St Richard of Chichester (c. 1197-1253)

Facetus, largus, curialis, vultu hilaris ("jolly, warm-hearted, courteous, and of a cheerful countenance"); in these words Friar Ralph Bocking described his old master, St Richard of Chichester, whom he served for many years as companion and confessor. There was something big and impressive about St Richard, something large, and warm, and comfortable. A Sussex downsman might well have said of him what a Cumberland dalesman said of William Temple: "He was a very *jolly* man." Elsewhere Bocking says that his name RICARDUS was made up of parts of three words: RIdens, CARus, and DUlciS, "laughing, beloved, and gracious".

"He was a very *jolly* man", a man whom you could not help loving because he seemed to love you, and everyone else, so much. If the Church had not seen fit to canonize him, he would certainly have been canonized by popular opinion, for he was just the sort of man whom people loved and revered. He came to his diocese of Chichester as a man in trouble—homeless, poor, outcast—yet he made light of his sufferings and devoted himself to his people and to the Church which he loved. It was unusual in those days to have a bishop of that kind. Most bishops were courtiers who followed the king about and looked after the affairs of state. Richard's predecessor, Ralph Neville, had been Chancellor of England, and so rarely set foot in his diocese that the Precentor of the cathedral had had to write to him and implore him to come down at Easter and take a little interest in the affairs of the Church there. Richard, on the other hand, hardly ever left his diocese, and then not by choice but by necessity.

He was born about 1197 at Droitwich. In spite of scholarly instincts he was obliged, as a boy, to live at home and try to rescue the family estates from the mismanagement of relatives. Our first picture of him is as an able and energetic young farmer, pulling the estate together, working hard at all sorts of manual jobs, and galvanizing a rather spineless elder brother into activity. When this job was satisfactorily done, he went to Oxford to pursue his studies. He was very poor and had to share one room and one gown with two other students. They took it in turns to wear the gown and attend the lectures. At Oxford, Richard came much under the influence of the saintly Edmund Rich, who took the younger man into his confidence and gave him much help. (Richard was older than most of the students of his day, an adult when most of them were in their teens and apt to be wild and undisciplined.) So Richard learnt much from his master; but he did not read theology or show any desire for ordination. After taking the arts course he read Canon Law, and went afterwards to Paris and Bologna for further study.

In 1235 Richard came back to England to be Chancellor of the University of Oxford and then Chancellor of the diocese of Canterbury, over which Edmund Rich now ruled. But times were difficult; and Edmund, though saintly, was no man for a fight, and in 1240 he

resigned the primacy and retired to Pontigny, taking Richard with him. They lived together in France for about five months, during which Richard underwent a great change. Hitherto his interests had been mainly in administration and law. Now he turned to theology, and, after the death of his master, went to live with the Dominicans at Orleans in order to have time for study. Here in 1243, at the age of 46, he was ordained to the priesthood.

He returned to England, and within a few months was elected Bishop of Chichester. On the death of Ralph Neville the canons had at first elected a royal favourite, Robert Passelew; but he was a forest judge and quite unfitted for a bishopric. (Robert Grosseteste had already refused to institute him to a parish in Northampton.) So the election was quashed by the archbishop and a new choice made. But Henry III was furious—so furious that he declined to recognize Richard as bishop, confiscated the estates, and threatened to punish anyone who gave him shelter.

For two years Richard was, therefore, homeless in his own diocese, obliged, as Bocking put it, "to sleep under another man's roof, to put his feet under another's table, and to warm himself at another's fire". In such circumstances any ordinary bishop would have fled overseas and waited until his income was restored to him. But Richard was not an ordinary bishop; he was a saint, and he knew that his work was with his own people in his own diocese. And in his diocese he lived, befriended by a poor priest, Simon of Tarring, who risked danger in giving shelter to a fugitive. So for two years Richard ruled his diocese with no home, no income, and no security.

In 1247 the quarrel was patched up, and the episcopal estates (though much reduced by rapacity and mismanagement) were restored to him. Richard was now able to enter upon his manors and entertain as a bishop should. But it was not for long. In 1253, while preaching on behalf of the seventh crusade, he went to Dover, where he dedicated a chapel in honour of St Edmund Rich. The next morning he was taken ill, and a few days later (April 3) he died.

Richard is remembered and revered not as a great scholar or a great political figure, but as a great pastor—a wise, diligent, and saintly bishop who administered his diocese with a perfect mixture of what St Paul calls "goodness and severity", of discipline and love. Richard had been trained as a lawyer and had a strong sense of order, yet he found himself called to the administration of a diocese sadly disorganized by neglect and by the fact that he himself was, for the first two years, a homeless vagrant. Yet he pulled it together. As early as 1246, while he was still under the royal ban, he published his Statutes which he expected all his people to observe. After the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 reform was much in the air, and several sets of diocesan decrees had already been issued by reforming bishops and legates. Richard based his Statutes on those of Richard le Poore, Bishop of Salisbury, but made them much shorter and simpler. What his clergy needed were the basic principles of an efficient and dignified ministry, and it was these that Richard tried to lay before them —simple rules about the Sacraments, about clerical life, and about

the conduct of monks and nuns. Cleanliness is often referred to, and decency, and good manners and things of that sort. "No priest", he says, "must celebrate in dirty or ragged vestments; he must use a chalice of gilt or silver and only the cleanest of altar linen. The elements must consist of bread of purest wheat and good wine mixed with a little water." Richard also realized the importance of the cathedral church as "caput et mater" of the whole diocese; granted an indulgence to those who gave money towards its upkeep; and instituted the system of "Richard's Pence" whereby each parish sent, by the hands of its incumbent, a contribution each year towards the fabric of the cathedral.

He was a strict disciplinarian—in his diocese, in his household, and in himself. Clergy who were lazy or immoral came in for severe rebuke, and he expelled one man from his living in spite of appeals from some of the highest personages in the land, including the king and queen. So also with the laity. A certain knight at Lewes, who had locked up his parish priest, was made to do penance by walking through the town carrying the log of wood to which the priest had been chained. When the people of Lewes dragged a thief out of a church, in which he had sought sanctuary, and lynched him, Richard made them dig up the body, carry it on their shoulders to the church, and give it Christian burial. Richard's strong sense of law was outraged by acts of violence and lawlessness, and he could punish severely. In his own household (when he was in a position to have one) he was much loved as a wise father, though here again he ruled with severity. Bocking speaks of him as caring "as a master for his pupils, as a father for his sons, and as a nurse for her babes". He expected high standards of honesty and uprightness among his household and dismissed those who misbehaved. But he was above all things severe with himself. Unlike many of his fellow bishops, he hated ostentation and display, and always dressed soberly and fared simply. Meanwhile his greatest self-discipline was in the realm of his prayer life. Early visitors to his chapel sometimes found the bishop stretched on the ground, having spent all night in prayer. On other occasions he would rise very early in the morning, and, while his chaplains still slept, would steal into the chapel to say his prayers before the day's work began. He used always to reproach himself if the birds were awake and singing their songs before he was at his prayers and praises before the altar of God.

Richard was, therefore, a disciplinarian; but the quality for which he was so greatly loved by his people was his generosity and affection. He loved to give things away, to the great distress of his stewards and bailiffs who were trying so hard to restore the ravaged resources of the diocese. "It is not my fault", he used to say, "that the diocese is impoverished; why then should I be punished for the sins of others by not being able to give due honour to guests and to relieve the poor?" So wherever he went he showered gifts on all whom he could find. When he entered a village he would ask the priest to give him the names of any in his parish who were poor or sick, so that he could visit them himself and relieve them with gifts of food or of money.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

The tenants on his manors were treated with the utmost consideration and generosity, many a farmer who had fallen on evil days finding his rent sent back to him on the bishop's orders. Wherever there was poverty or distress there Richard's warm and generous soul was touched, and he was restless until he had done something to show his sympathy and, if possible, to give relief. Bocking records that, on many occasions, the bishop went out of his way to bury the dead "with his own hands" in order to show his love and compassion. He founded a hospital for old priests who were blind, or poor, or sick. When money was short he gave away gold or silver cups, rings, horses, clothes, anything he could lay hands on. When his stewards remonstrated with him, and implored him not to be so reckless, he replied: "Cheer up! We still have enough to live on."

To a man so carefree, so loving, so humble, and so good, it was inevitable that strange things should happen from time to time, and there are many miracles connected with Richard's life, many of them very human. Once, when celebrating Candlemas at Cakeham, he joined in a procession which went outside the church, each member carrying a lighted candle. A gust of wind blew all the candles out, but the procession went on. Suddenly it was noticed that the bishop's candle was alight again. "Who lit my candle?" said Richard to one of his chaplains. "No one, my lord," came the reply. Richard looked again at the candle, then put his finger to his lips and said: "Not a word."

Out of a century which produced many great lights the candle of St Richard of Chichester still burns brightly, for he was a great saint, a great pastor, a great lover of God and man.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The chief source for the life of St Richard is the Life of him by Ralph Bocking in *Acta Sanctorum, April*, vol. i, where will also be found a later life by John Capgrave. His Statutes are in Wilkins, *Concilia*, i, pp. 688–93, and his Will in *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, vol. i. There is a seventeenth-century manuscript Life in English in the British Museum (Lansdowne, 340) and a printed Life in Italian published in 1706. See also: *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, vol. xliv; M. Tout in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; M. R. Capes, *S. Richard of Chichester* (1913); and C. M. Duncan Jones, *S. Richard of Chichester* (new ed. 1952).

J. R. H. Moorman.

Cosin's Hours of Prayer: A Liturgical Review

The Devotions . . . called the Hours of Prayer first appeared in 1627. Since then they have been the classical English order of the Canonical Hours. Next to the various versions of the Prayer Book itself they have been the most important Anglican liturgical compilation since the Reformation.

In spite of their well-known historical importance they have not hitherto received the liturgical study they merit. The present paper will attempt briefly to survey the previous Anglican versions of the Little Office on which the Devotions are largely based. We will then

proceed to describe Cosin's Hours, saying something of their interest and value, and indicating, apparently for the first time, their sources.

The medieval Little Office of our Lady began to undergo alterations in the primers published during the reign of Henry VIII. The last of these is the King's Primer of 1545. Its Little Office is distinguished by several peculiarities. The midday services are excessively brief. The offices are given a new variety by introducing different hymns from the breviary for the successive Hours. Another innovation was a series of collects based on the Beatitudes. The success of these Henrician primers is clear. Reformer Edward, Counter-reformer Mary, and Anglican Elizabeth, all issued official primers based on the Reformed Catholic editions of their father's reign. The layman's version of the Daily Office thus remained largely the same right through the turmoils of the age. At the same time, important features of the Little Office (e.g. the ferial use of the *Te Deum*, the abandonement of all the O.T. canticles at Lauds except *Benedicite*) found a permanent place in the Prayer Book.

In 1559 the Prayer Book was at last permanently adopted. Its companionpiece, the first Elizabethan primer, was published under official auspices the same year. The Little Office contained in the latter was, with few changes, that of 1545. An inferior Latin version appeared in the *Orarium* of 1560. By now certain features of the breviary and Prayer Book, such as the creed and collect for grace at Prime, were introduced for the first time into the Little Office. Most of the psalms were still drawn from the traditional office of our Lady.

In 1564 appeared the *Preces Privatae*, like the others officially sponsored. Its offices consisted of Matins and Lauds, Vespers and Compline, ingeniously arranged to include much of the material previously assigned to the other Hours. Each pair of services paralleled the sequence of the Prayer Book. Matins, for instance, had only an Old Testament lesson; after its psalms, Lauds had a New Testament lesson, *Benedictus*, creed, and prayers. Antiphons, hymns, and versicles were interpolated at appropriate points. The anonymous editor was the first to demonstrate to the Church that Cranmer had not exhausted the possibilities of Anglican liturgical creativity. The *Preces* were reprinted in 1568 and 1573.

When Cosin's *Devotions* appeared, the very existence of these Elizabethan books seems to have been generally unknown. His titlepage cites the *Orarium* of 1560 as a precedent; the preface also refers to that of 1573, i.e. the third edition of the *Preces*. The English primer of 1559 was unhappily unknown to him. Cosin drew, as we shall see, much from these books, but his purpose was different. The Elizabethan primers provided stepping stones from the medieval offices to the Prayer Book. Cosin, on the other hand, sought to attract those bred on the Prayer Book back to the older intervals of prayer. He also wished to provide something more substantial and more varied in its theological references than the Little Office had been. He endeavoured to reproduce, in other words, the Divine Office of the breviary rather than the Little Office of the primer. Other parts of Cosin's book, such as the Ember Day devotions, are of consider-

able historical importance, but unhappily they fall outside the scope of the present essay.

Let us now survey Cosin's Hours. Prayers before the Office consist of the traditional English verse, "God, be in my head", and the collect "Prevent me, O Lord". Then, as in the *Preces Privatae*, we have the General Confession and the Absolution in a precatory form. There is but one service for Matins, Lauds, and Prime. Based on the *Preces*, it follows the Prayer Book in general arrangement. The author notes that division of the First Hour into several services was not primitive.

Matins opens with "Our Father", the usual versicles, and *Venite*. The hymn is *Iam Lucis Orto Sidere*. Originally assigned to Prime in the breviary, the King's Primer introduced it into Matins of our Lady. The psalms, 8, 19, and 24, were those traditional to the Little Office. The Old Testament lesson is a cento from Proverbs, based on one introduced in 1560. The *Te Deum* concludes Matins. A rubric and "Praise the Lord" open the Lauds. The substance of this office is restored by the convenient expedient of inserting the traditional psalms 148-50 before the *Benedicite*. This simple interpolation may have its uses to-day, especially on festal occasions. The New Testament lesson is the Beatitudes, which had been used for antiphons in the Elizabethan primers. The *Benedictus*, creed, etc., follow. After the third collect there is a series of very fine personal prayers, unusual for their brevity. The third seems to be based on the *Suscipe* of Ignatius Loyola. The last three are interesting. They are based on various clauses of the *Precatio Aurea*, a long daily prayer of St Thomas Aquinas. The 1559 primer contained a famous translation made by Queen Mary when eleven years old. The inept editor 1560 retranslated it into Latin. Cosin seems to have known Mary's translation, but here, as elsewhere, he feels free to alter. Two Prayer Book collects and a doxology (1 Tim. 1. 17) conclude the office. Except for the choice of antiphons, the blessings before and the versicles after lessons, and the concluding prayers, the First Hour is mainly an English version of the morning offices in the *Preces Privatae*.

The three midday Hours follow the traditional pattern, but the choice of material is original. Each office is rather long: "Our Father", versicles, hymn, three psalms, blessing, lesson, versicles, two prayers, and doxology. The hymn at Terce is the first appearance of Cosin's now beloved *Veni Creator*. The other two Hours have brief original lyrics. The psalms have no traditional connexion with their respective Hours. The author seems to have kept his choices within the limits of the perennial favourites. At least one psalm, however, is closely related to the theme of each Hour (145 at III, 116 at VI, 54 at IX).

The two prayers or collects at the end of each of these Hours have a considerable interest. Although Cosin has in some way altered every one, they all have older sources. At Terce, we have expanded versions of the Whitsunday Collect (traditional for Memorial of the Holy Ghost at Lauds) and of the Confirmation prayer for the Seven Gifts. It is a good combination. At Sext the first is a variant of the

antiphon of the Cross, "O Saviour of the World". The second prayer is adapted from the collect for the Compassion of our Lady. This had been printed after every Hour in the Sarum Enchiridion. The first prayer at Nones is equally medieval. It is an arrangement of "O Jesu . . . thou Brightness and Image", one of the "Fifteen O's of St Bridget". This was a famous series of Passion prayers appearing in many medieval primers. This particular "O" has a considerable profundity. It poetically hints that the Passion is a recapitulation of the Creation; the Crucified Son is the Image of God; his expiration returns to God the life-breath of Man; his death returns to man immortality. A variant of the Palm Sunday collect follows.

"Evensong" or Vespers follows the pattern of the Midday Hours. The hymn is *Salvator Mundi Domine,* as in the previous Anglican primers. Psalms 111 and 112 are traditional to Sunday Vespers; 141 is appropriate in view of verse 2. After the lesson comes the *Magnificat* and four prayers. First is the Prayer Book collect for peace, a traditional element in the Little Office. Next is one of the final collects for Ante-Communion. The two following have a curious history. They originated in two prayers in Erasmus' *Precationes Aliquot.* One was for evening; the other, the *Diluculo, ad Christum,* for morning. English variants were used in the King's Primer among the miscellaneous prayers not connected with the Little Office. The unhappy editor of 1560 retranslated them into Latin. Two full-length variants of the evening prayer appeared in the *Orarium,* and a condensed form was used as the collect at Vespers. An adaptation of the latter is Cosin's third collect at Vespers. The morning prayer also appeared in two places among the prayers of the *Orarium.* Cosin adapted it for his fourth collect at Vespers. Thus these two prayers went from Latin to English to Latin and finally into Cosin's English.

Compline derives most of its contents not from the Little Office, but from the breviary. It is extremely short. It opens with an antiphon and psalm 91, the first six verses only. The lesson is the traditional 1 Pet. 5. 8, followed by 2 Pet. 3. 10 f. Then come *Nunc Dimittus,* creed, *Kyrie,* and "Our Father". An antiphon introduces two prayers. The first derives from a full-length paraphrase of Erasmus' evening prayer, discussed in regard to Vespers. The second is the third collect of Evensong, deriving from the Sarum Compline. As in the *Preces Privatae,* a few phrases of the traditional Compline appear among the informal bed-time prayers after the office.

It will be seen that Cosin's morning and evening offices are close to those of the Prayer Book, for they are close to the services of the primer and breviary from which the latter was derived. At the Midday Hours, Cosin has created original and striking compilations of traditional and Biblical material. Much more than in the Latin versions, Terce is an office of the Holy Ghost, and Sext and Nones are offices of the Passion.

The *Devotions* were reprinted regularly until the tenth edition of 1719. Their recitation, probably only the midday offices, was introduced by Cosin into the Peterhouse Chapel at Cambridge. This was one of the causes of his persecution by the Puritans. Various parts of

the book considerably influenced the Prayer Book revision of 1662, as is well known. The 1838 edition was the first version of the Canonical Hours published for use after the Oxford Movement. A decade later, when the Religious Life was revived, Mother Lydia Sellon's sisters at Devonport used Cosin's Midday Hours between Mattins and Evensong in the parish church. Subsequently, the *Devotions* have continued to influence versions of the Hours published for occasional and lay use. In recent revisions of the Prayer Book in many parts of the world, Cosin's work continues to make itself felt.

As the old primer contributed much to the Prayer Book, so the latter contributed much to the Elizabethan primers and to Cosin. His *Devotions* in turn have given much to the Prayer Book. As the acknowledged successor of the official primers of Queen Elizabeth I, and as the inaugurator of subsequent liturgical developments, the *Devotions* have a unique place in the Anglican tradition.

In conclusion, let it not be supposed, however, that Cosin was alone among his contemporaries in teaching the traditional intervals of prayer. On the contrary, *most* of the classical Anglican devotional writers urge at least a partial observance of the Hours. Laud's *Private Devotions*, *The Whole Duty of Man*, Sherlock's *Practical Christian*, Andrewes's *Preces Privatae*, and Law's *Serious Call*, provide for, or urge, the ancient times of prayer. Less complete or less formal arrangements are presented by Bishop Wilson, Richard Hele, the Austin-Hopton series, and Jeremy Taylor, among others. The offices compiled by these writers are a rich field for study, and in some cases they are quite unexplored.

Cosin then is not unique among the Anglican divines in providing for the Hours. His uniqueness consists, rather, in providing offices so closely linked with both the previous and subsequent liturgical developments of our Church. The *Devotions* remain pre-eminent as the classical Anglican version of the Canonical Hours.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Detailed information about the dates and editions of primers and related office books will be found in Edgar Hoskin's *Horae Beatae Mariae*, London, 1901. A more popular discussion is in Helen C. White's *The Tudor Books of Private Devotion*, University of Wisconsin, 1951.

The Elizabethan primers are reprinted in the Parker Society volume, *Private Prayers . . . during the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Cambridge, 1851. Most of the O's of St Bridget are in pp. 507–12 of the same volume.

The text of Cosin's *Devotions* may be studied in vol. ii of *Cosin's Works* in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.

BOONE PORTER.

American Letter: No. 15

POLITY AND DISCIPLINE

THE fact that the Republic emerged from the throes of a civil war in which the minority was victorious had much to do with the character of American Anglicanism. Samuel Seabury, first of the bishops, had been a "King's man" throughout the revolt. But, with the fighting done, his full strength was thrown into the task of establishing

the young neglected church as an autonomous segment of the Anglican Communion. Americans were not used to bishops. Though the collapsing ruins of the first church building erected at Jamestown in 1607 still stood, none of the Bishops of London had ever visited their overseas jurisdiction. Confirmation was a sacrament unknown to all but a handful of wealthy colonists who dared the Atlantic crossing in the hope that, somehow, their bewigged and bewildered diocesan might be persuaded to confirm them. Washington himself was not taken to England by a mother whose dread of the sea also prevented him from accepting a commission in His Majesty's navy. In such circumstances nothing would have been easier for the church—with neither bishops nor a canon law—than to have slipped into a congregational polity with an English liturgy doomed to quick abandonment by a people to whose needs it was now unsuited.

But Samuel Seabury, chosen by the clergy to seek consecration in England, was undaunted by the refusal of the bishops there to do anything of the sort. How could one who owed political allegiance to an alien power be made "a Bishop in the Church of God"? An incredible legalism characteristic of the age blinded them to the probability that the canonical oath of allegiance to the King was automatically nullified by the facts of the case. So, in 1784, this scholarly Rector of New York was consecrated at Aberdeen by the non-jurors on condition that he do his utmost to have the canon of the Scottish liturgy become "the American use". Certainly, too, Seabury's powerful influence is to be seen in the significant sentence in the Preface of the American Prayer Book: " . . *it will also appear that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship: or further than local circumstances require.*" In fact, the entire Preface exhibits the determination of our spiritual founding fathers to hold "this Church" firmly within the framework of the Anglican tradition. Nor was this task made easier by the extreme unpopularity of those whom puritans and other protestants called "impious prelates", always suspected of a secret devotion to the dispossessed monarch, and frequently accused of being "Jesuits in disguise"—emissaries of the "Beast of Babylon" himself.

Be that as it may, the crux of our discussion is found in the phrase "or further than local circumstances require". But local circumstances may compel sweeping changes in the frame which holds historic principles secure. In startling fashion new necessities altered the traditional English methods of filling vacant sees and of creating new ones. Bishops could be neither appointed by non-existent monarchs nor elected by cathedral chapters yet unborn. Hence the *Constitution and Canons,* themselves the issue of the first General Convention held in 1789, require that all diocesans, coadjutors, and suffragans be elected by the clergy and laity voting separately in diocesan conventions called for that purpose alone.

However, the diocese is not completely autonomous in its choice of a bishop. Should the election occur within the space of three

months before the triennial meeting of the General Convention its result must be confirmed by the House of Bishops, whereupon the Presiding Bishop "shall, without delay, . . . take order for the consecration of the said Bishop elect". On the other hand, should the election take place more than three months before a meeting of the General Convention a somewhat clumsy procedure is required. When the candidate has secured a majority of both the clerical and lay orders of the Diocesan Convention, notice of his election must be sent to the Standing Committee of every diocese. Only when a majority of these committees have given their consent may the Presiding Bishop take order for the consecration. This process may occupy several months: a nerve-wracking ordeal for the chosen priest, yet one which protects the diocese from error and consoles the bishop-elect with the knowledge that he has been the choice of the whole church. Cumbersome as this method is, it does assure the preservation of the democratic idea in diocesan elections. To be sure, such elections often are accompanied by close voting requiring innumerable ballots, and by sharp divisions between groups of differing churchmanship. Sometimes "the best man" cannot be elected and compromise is necessary—often to the ultimate advantage of the whole church, for lay voters may be carried away by exciting nominating speeches which do not always stress the qualities most essential to "the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God".

But the English reader may be puzzled by a curious anomaly certainly peculiar to the American segment of the Anglican communion. Here a bishop is always a bishop, but an Episcopal jurisdiction is by no means always a diocese! Here a Missionary Diocese becomes a *Missionary District* which, because it is not financially self-supporting, can neither elect its own bishop nor have representation according to its population in the General Convention. While a diocese may send four priests and four laymen to that convention, the Missionary District—regardless of the number of its communicants—is restricted to one parson and one layman, together with its bishop. In this strange episcopal jurisdiction the bishop is appointed by the House of Bishops without regard to the wishes of the clergy and people most concerned; a method sometimes far from satisfactory, but often highly successful when the man chosen is great enough not to succumb to the temptations of the almost absolute power given him in this office. Certainly he is directly responsible to the far-distant and utterly overburdened Presiding Bishop, yet within his jurisdiction he is the perfect modern illustration of the old Monarchical Episcopate.

Limits of space forbid the discussion of the Provincial Synods: great, unwieldy, debating societies quite devoid of legislative or other authority, but somewhat useful as advisory bodies whose voices often manage to be heard within the halls of the General Convention. This lack of authority is gradually becoming painful as people grow aware of the fact that lay representation in the General Convention ceases to be democratic except on paper. Laymen must travel fright-

ening distances, sometimes across the full four thousand miles of the continent, at their own expense. Consequently only the rich and the somewhat idle can accept election to their church's governing body. Rectors and vicars, since their expenses are paid in the event of election, have no such problem.

But what are "rectors and vicars"? A vicar is a priest (or deacon) in charge of a *mission*—any congregation incapable of self-support—who is completely subject to the will of the bishop under the canon law. He is "the Bishop's vicar". On the other hand, a rector is a priest in full charge of a parish—a self-contained, self-supporting unit whose people (through a vestry of their own election) "call" their priest from anywhere within the Anglican communion. He is *the Rector* and, as such, is entirely independent of episcopal control so long as his behaviour conforms to national and diocesan canons, the latter of which must not contradict or correct the former. The fact that this almost uncontrolled freedom of choice may have disastrous results is an increasing cause of concern among the bishops. Bishops may recommend priests to vacant parishes, but the vestries are not bound to heed these recommendations. To be sure, the vestry in search of a rector must give the diocesan a period of time "not exceeding thirty days" in which to undertake any investigation he may deem to be essential. But, even so, the governing canon controls his decision with these futile words: ". . . if the Ecclesiastical Authority be satisfied that the person so chosen is a duly qualified Minister, and that he has accepted the office . . .". A similar rule governs the appointment of assistant clergy. The bishop appoints but he does not choose. But despite its obvious problems the method has worked reasonably well. It does act as a check upon bishops who might be governed in their choice of clergy by partisan principles—a tragic happening in Missionary Districts of which the writer has had experience.

While matters of morals are adequately handled by the general and diocesan canons, the entrenched position of a rector obviously creates disciplinary problems. He does have tenure. Though vestries may "call" him, getting rid of him should he prove to be inadequate is another matter. Neither may he resign without the consent of the vestry, nor can he be dismissed against his will unless, of course, he has been convicted of some moral offence. However, Canon 46 ("Of the Dissolution of the Pastoral Relation") provides for the Episcopal arbitration of cases in which either the rector or the vestry (against the will of the other) desires to bring the pastoral relationship to an end. Naturally, perhaps, the writer has not known of any parish which has called upon the bishop to prevent the resignation of a rector. The shoe almost always is on the other foot. In such cases the bishop, if unable to bring about an amicable settlement, must "ask the advice of the Standing Committee of the Diocese . . . and, proceeding with its aid and counsel, shall be the ultimate arbiter and judge". The judgment "shall be either that the pastoral relation . . . shall cease . . .; or that the said relation shall not be terminated; and

such judgment shall be binding upon both parties". Adequate penalties for the disobedience of either rector or vestry are provided elsewhere in the Canon Law.

The discipline of the laity is, for the most part, merely an enlargement of the rubrical requirements which (in these instances) already exist in the Prayer Book of 1662. For example, a priest may repel from the Holy Communion one who violates the final rubrics of that office. But, on the appeal of the repelled communicant, the bishop for adequate reasons may in writing require his restoration. Again, a priest may not admit to Holy Baptism, or Confirmation, or Holy Communion a person who "has been married otherwise than as the word of God and discipline of this Church allow" unless the "Bishop . . . shall give his judgment thereon in writing". However, none of these ordinances may be refused "to a penitent person in imminent danger of death". In such cases, as in those concerning Holy Matrimony, the bishop may be counselled by an Ecclesiastical Court set up by his diocese.

For many years the canons governing "The Solemnization of Holy Matrimony" have been a bone of contention. But the existing canons, while frequently incorrectly phrased and here and there indecisive, are not likely to be changed for some time. Nine *impediments*, for the most part in accordance with traditional theology, are clearly stated. In a concession to modern criticism the Matthean "except for the cause of adultery" has been dropped as not of divine authority. Persons whose unions have been declared "null and void *ab initio*" may apply through their pastor to the bishop for the right to contract and have solemnized a new union, "if the Bishop or Ecclesiastical Authority is satisfied that the parties intend a true Christian marriage". While some bishops are inclined to interpret the words in a loose and sentimental fashion, the canons themselves are decisive enough in defining the real nature of Christian marriage as a lifelong union between believers contracted in the absence of all of the nine basic impediments. Certainly some of the clergy are not content with a canon which recognizes as "a Christian marriage" a union between a believer and a pagan—at least, between a Christian and an unbaptized person. However, scruples of the priestly conscience are protected by the proviso that "*It shall be within the discretion of any minister of this Church to decline to solemnize any marriage*". Whatever the defects of our canons governing Holy Matrimony we have some consolation in the knowledge that it is far easier for a Romanist than it is for an Anglican to have his old marriage annulled that he may pursue a new light of love.

This has been an altogether too brief and episodic treatment of a great subject. Yet, while exhibiting some of the notable differences between our two segments of the Anglican Communion, it should suffice to show that the American Church has not departed "from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship: or further than local circumstances require".

Eric Montizambert.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. W. M. F. Scott is Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

Dr Moorman is Principal of Chichester Theological College.

The Rev. Boone Porter, formerly a Fellow and Tutor of the General Theological Seminary, New York City, is now engaged in liturgical research at Worcester College, Oxford.

The Rev. Eric Montizambert is Canon of Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, and Warden of the School of the Prophets.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Doubtless as Dr Hanson grows older he will come to believe many things which now seem to him incredible. But, whether he believes it or not, it *was* in 1454 that Pope Nicholas V established the Portuguese *Padroado* in Africa and the East. It is not at all surprising that he did so, in view of the extent and success of the adventures in exploration directed by Prince Henry the Navigator. But Dr Hanson is so far right that, in trying to compress a complicated series of facts into a sentence or two, as I had to do on almost every page of my book *The Christian Society*, I was guilty of some telescoping; it would have been more accurate to write: "In a long series of enactments, from the Bull *Pontifex Maximus* of Nicholas V issued on 8 January 1455 to the *Aequum reputamus* of Paul III, issued on 3 November 1534, successive Popes divided the newly discovered lands", etc.

The *Padroado* in India was at long last brought to an end on 20 July 1950. I do not know of any book in English on this important and at times highly entertaining subject; Dr Hanson would very much enjoy writing one. In the meantime, the most important facts are briefly set out, with bibliographical notes, by Professor R. Aubenas, in Fliche et Martin, *Histoire de l'Église*, vol. 15, pp. 122–6.

Yours faithfully,

STEPHEN NEILL, *Bishop.*

GENEVA,
9 *December* 1952.

[DR HANSON writes: "Bishop Neill wrote in one paragraph of Christopher Columbus's desire to spread the faith among Indians in the lands discovered by him, and in the next he mentions a Bull issued in 1454, describing it as 'dividing the newly discovered lands between the kings of Spain and Portugal', and next goes on to tell how the Pope drew a line down the Atlantic on the map. This is telescoping so esoteric as to recall the methods of Humpty Dumpty. Whether sarcasm is the best tone in which to reply to criticism of such a procedure, I leave the readers of THEOLOGY to decide."]

FAITH AND POLICY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It is natural that I should have read your article on *The Welfare State from a Christian Point of View* with particular interest. The path which I tried to follow in *The Just Tax* is a rather lonely one, and after reading your article, which might almost be summarized as "what every thinking Christian must by now surely agree to", I am not much comforted. Can there be any but an inverted relationship between loving and helping one another and being mulcted without choice for purposes which may be partly philanthropic but which in any case we cannot control? Is it possible to compel men to care for one another, or even for themselves? Does not the abolition of consent utterly change the whole spirit of the thing? Leaving out details and blemishes in application—can we really accept the policy of the modern centralizing collectivist State as being fundamentally Christian?

One of the most faith-shattering statements I have ever read was that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, at a Mansion House dinner in June 1950, was reported to have said: "The Dean of Canterbury, in spite of his political views, is not an anti-Christian, but holds, profoundly and sincerely, precisely the same Christian faith as you and I hold." Any faith which goes deeper than words must inevitably give rise to a *policy*—that is, a long-term line of action tending towards definite objectives. A tree may be judged by its fruit, and a faith by the policy which arises from it. It is always possible to distinguish the pursuit of different policies from mere disagreements about programs and methods.

I am certain, with very good reason, that I am trying to pursue a different policy from that of the Dean of Canterbury, and I have also studied the Welfare State until I am satisfied that it expresses, in less objectionable form perhaps, the same policy and underlying faith as do the other collectivist States, in Russia and elsewhere. These things are not Christian in nature or in origin, but arose from secret, or semi-secret, and anti-Christian societies and movements. If this also is what the general faith of the Church of England amounts to, when it comes to be applied in practice in the modern world, then I cannot share it; and there will be others also who will be excluded from a place in the Church which opens its arms most widely, to include everyone from Catholic to Protestant, from modernist to fundamentalist, and from communist to diehard Tory. As the policy of the collectivist State emerges more clearly, there will be many more who will turn to the Church for help and succour; for an alternative, for something better; not for another dose of the same policy. Let us hope that they will find it.

Yours sincerely,

GEOFFREY DOBBS.

BODIFYR, BANGOR, CAERNARVONSHIRE.
8 *December* 1952.

[A. R. V. writes: "The title of my article in the December number was designed to indicate that it purported to express *a* (not *the*) Christian point of view. I shall always resist the contention that only one policy, whether long-term or short-term, is consistent with faith in Christ or membership of the Church. Men cannot be compelled by legislation to feel love for one another, but in some matters they can be compelled by legislation to do a rough justice to one another and even to care for themselves. Christians may reasonably disagree about the extent to which such compulsion is salutary, and about whether in particular cases it should be approved or opposed, welcomed or resented. So far from regarding 'what every thinking Christian must by now surely agree to' as a perceptive summary of my article, I had hoped that it focused attention on a variety of open and important questions concerning where we ought to go from here (of which centralization in the social services was one, but only one). I do not believe that the Welfare State is inevitably developing into totalitarianism. But it most likely would do so if a majority of citizens came to suppose that it must."]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE CHURCH. By Emil Brunner. Translated by Harold Knight. Lutterworth Press. 10s. 6d.

The appearance of this book during the time of preparation for the Lund Conference (it is dated in the spring of 1951) was timely and added greatly to its value and importance; for, in strong contrast with the somewhat conventional and pedestrian character of the volume on *The Nature of the Church* prepared for the Conference by members of the various communions, it is concerned to go to the heart of the matter, to criticize the basic presuppositions underlying the doctrine of the Church in all its contemporary denominational forms, and to seek to elucidate the nature of the ecclesia as it is presented to us by the New Testament. If Dr Brunner is right, none of those denominational statements can claim to speak of the essential Christian fellowship which is the Body of Christ; they are concerned rather with the different forms of ecclesiastical organization which may be regarded as the outward shell or husk in which the true ecclesia has been partially preserved and transmitted through history, but which might well have to be discarded if that ideal New Testament society were to be manifested in its fulness. His argument is both highly controversial and highly important. It cuts across the main lines of the whole contemporary debate on the doctrine of the Church by asserting that both Catholics and Protestants are right and wrong at the same time in what they are saying about the Church. Catholics are right in rejecting the theory of the invisible Church in Calvin's sense of the phrase and in refusing to accept his view of the visible Church as a mere *externum subsidium fidei*; they are wrong in supposing that the Body of Christ on which they lay such proper emphasis is the institutional Church as it has developed in history. Protestants are wrong in their relatively "low" and individualistic conception of the Christian society, but right in taking such a view of the institutional organization.

Dr Brunner's thesis is based upon a sharp distinction between the

New Testament ecclesia on the one hand and the phenomenal institution of the Church on the other, which can only be, at best, the vessel in which the former is inadequately contained. The former is constituted by the Word of God, and is the bearer of the Spirit: "Where the Holy Ghost is, there is the Christian communion", which is rightly to be described as the *mater omnium piorum*. It is a personal fellowship of the faithful with Christ through the Spirit, the sphere of the divine self-revelation. It is not a means of salvation but an end in itself, despite the fact that on earth the final goal of the ecclesia is not yet perfectly attained. The Church, on the other hand, "is rather something which has arisen . . . through a process of development, transformation, and retrogression, out of the New Testament ecclesia". It is not "a pure communion of persons" but "a thing, an institution". The attempt to reconcile the discrepancy between the two by means of the distinction between the visible and the invisible Church is useless, for neither of these can be said to correspond to the New Testament conception of the Christian body. Still less can the ecclesia be held to correspond with any one of the existing Churches.

Dr Brunner begins his examination of the relation of Church to ecclesia with a survey of the Biblical doctrine of the people of God "whose history doubtless begins with the old covenant, but which only attains full reality through the living presence of the Risen Lord". He next considers the nature of the primitive community, paying special attention to the vital importance of the apostolate, without which there could have been no Christian society at all. Great emphasis is laid on the central importance of apostolic authority, but this authority is that of commissioned eye-witnesses and ambassadors of the Gospel; it is essentially untransferable, and as the community "comes of age" in its reception of the Gospel the authority of the apostles diminishes. It passes over into the authority of the canonical deposit of apostolic witness in Scripture, by which the community must continually verify and correct its understanding and doctrine. The final and decisive authority in the community of the ecclesia was not a hierarchical order but the truth of the Christian message itself. The Jerusalem church did indeed develop an administrative and hierarchical conception of the apostolic office, but this was overruled at the Apostolic Council and vanished with the destruction of Jerusalem. The author recognizes in this connexion the force of the Catholic argument that not only the word of Christ but also his will "and its ordering, unifying, function in the Church" must be given full weight in assessing the nature of the apostolate. He admits the need for hierarchical authority in a church; but he maintains that in the general mind of the primitive community this conception of authority simply did not exist.

Dr Brunner then examines the concept of tradition, distinguishing the primitive notion of tradition as the preservation and transmission of the Gospel itself, the early Church's attempt to safeguard its purity by laying emphasis on the episcopal succession in the apostolic churches (a course which, despite the genuine desire of the Church to

realize the Vincentian principle, tended to confuse continuity of office with continuity of teaching and so paved the way for gradual distortions) and the later concept of the Church as a corporate body ruled by the Pope and defining its doctrine in virtue of the authority of the corporation, or of its head, from which it emanates. The final stage in the process is seen in the Vatican decree and the definition of the dogma of the Assumption. Against this juridical view of authority is to be set the faith, fellowship, and unity of a personal communion indwelt by the energizing Spirit, and the consciousness of the Church's eschatological character which should, had it not been largely lost, have prevented the growth of ecclesiastical rule and jurisdiction.

The transformation of the primitive ecclesia as the Body of Christ living in the fellowship of the Spirit into the hierarchical Church is traced to the simultaneous development of the episcopate and its authority as a weapon against heresy, and of a non-Scriptural sacramentalism bringing in its train the sacerdotalist conception of the Ministry.

In the final chapters the defects of the churches are analysed and an assessment is made of the extent to which the characteristics of the true ecclesia have been preserved by them; the conclusion is that "with or without the churches, if necessary even in opposition to them, God will cause the ecclesia to become a real community of brothers".

There is much food for reflection in this book. Much of its argument will commend itself to those Anglicans who share the views enunciated, for example in the recent report, *The Fulness of Christ.* It is, however, probable that the author's picture of the primitive Church is one-sided and incomplete, as his handling of the difficult problem of the Jerusalem Church indicates. The historical reality of the apostolic Church appears to have been confused with the ideal Church, or the perfect Church which can only be manifested eschatologically. The Church's fulness is to be sought by looking forward rather than backward to the primitive society, and the attempt to find it in history leads to historical distortion. Dr Brunner's picture of the ideal ecclesia is inspiring and true, and it should be the ultimate goal of the ecumenical movement; but his historical survey is often superficial. A better and more accurate treatment of the apostolic Church in respect of the central themes of this book has been given to English readers in Canon R. R. Williams' recent work, *Authority in the Apostolic Age.*

St John's College,
Oxford.

G. W. H. Lampe.

Old Testament Apocalyptic. Its Origin and Growth. By S. B. Frost. Epworth Press. 22s. 6d.

At a time when the theological air is electric with eschatology and when many are claiming that the recovery of the true eschatological nature of the Christian proclamation is the greatest single theological achievement of our day, a book on the Old Testament *preparatio* is

assured of careful scrutiny. The author raises hopes when he confesses in his Preface that it was the desire to understand the eschatology of the Christian Faith which first led him to investigate the origins of Apocalyptic. These hopes cannot be said to be fulfilled. He does not seem to be aware of the issues in the contemporary discussion. His last chapter, which is an attempt precisely to estimate the significance of Apocalyptic for faith and theology, does not mention Althaus or Barth or Cullmann or their interpreters in this country; and even if it is permitted not to name them, it is not permitted to overlook their contributions. The author's use of the term "realized eschatology" on pp. 43, 246 suggests that he has not understood Dodd; nor is it clear that what he means by "de-mythologizing" is just what Bultmann means. At this level we receive no light.

On the other hand, the main burden of the book, as its title suggests, is a comprehensive, critical study of the origin and development of the Apocalyptic movement before Christ—and here lies its usefulness. On the whole, clear-cut explanations are offered for the manifold perplexities inherent in the subject, and when they are set together, as in the penultimate chapter, the result is a neat account of the movement, if anything, over-simplified and more precise than the evidence warrants, yet not unattractive in its completeness and certainly deserving attention.

Apocalyptic, whose formal characteristics are enumerated as a setting in history, appeal to history, nationalism, anonymity and pseudonymity, mythology and symbolism, is regarded as a natural development from prophetic and liturgical origins within Israel. Thus these same characteristics are found, for example, in Psalm 74. Here, at the outset, lies one of the author's more conspicuous ambiguities, since it is not quite clear what this is meant to prove. The psalm is "embryo-apocalyptic" and thought to belong to the fifth to the third centuries, the centuries of apocalyptic beginnings (p. 7), yet is "not itself to be regarded as in any way apocalyptic"! (p. 17). The movement is taken as "the expression of a persecution complex" in the post-exilic years of despair, an attempt to justify the ways of God to men by presenting the hope of a Golden Age. The "content" of Apocalyptic is described as determinism, the hope of a Golden Age, developed belief in angels and demons and a doctrine of resurrection.

But the author's fundamental thesis is contained in his definition of Apocalyptic as "mythologized eschatology", the eschatology being originally Hebraic and pre-prophetic, the mythologizing being a process due to Babylonian influences manifest first in a person designated "Babylonian Ezekiel". Widely held assumptions about the foreign origin of Hebrew eschatology are thereby challenged. The reviewer remains unconvinced either that eschatology is to be found so early in pre-exilic thought or that the mythologizing process was, so to speak, an exilic invasion. It is perfectly correct to draw attention to "teleological history" in the Jahwist historian and to suggest that the very idea of election *ultimately* involves an eschaton. It is quite another thing to detect "realized eschatology" actually within his work and to associate it with the revival of Southern Hebrew for-

tunes after the reign of Solomon. Nor is it certain that eschatology (in its proper meaning) is to be found in any of the pre-exilic prophets. We agree with Lindblom's recent lament that scholars have "often sadly misunderstood the symbolic language used by the writers of the Old Testament". The great error is to treat as eschatology what is in fact simply poetry, and the problem is to know where poetical descriptions of future history end and eschatology begins.

We have no space to discuss Dr Frost's interesting treatment of Messianism, raising a host of further questions. The main line of his thesis proceeds via the discussion of Ezekiel, Zechariah, Joel, certain glosses in Isaiah (called "Extra-Isaiah") and Deutero-Zechariah who together represent "anonymous Apocalyptic". The work of Babylonian Ezekiel is said to give rise to the kind of unobtrusive annotation of the prophetic oracles that we find in Extra-Isaiah, an activity which "acquired a literary aspect" so that eventually "oracles duly annotated were built up into fabricated apocalypses" such as Deutero-Zechariah. (We do not predict a future for the phrase "fabricated apocalypse", suggestive as it is more of fabrication than of fabric!)

As each section of the literature comes up for investigation, it is subjected to a critical analysis which in its turn will cause much division of opinion. That is inevitable and often fruitful. We disagree utterly, for example, with the handling of Ezekiel and think it high time that he was rehabilitated as the great prophet he is. But this does not happen to affect materially the thesis of this book. On the other hand, it seems to us that a dated critical orthodoxy has led Dr Frost astray in the next section of his book dealing with "pseudonymous Apocalyptic". It is surely because he fails to see the positive function of "tradition-circles" in transmitting the master's oracles that he can regard the Isaiah Apocalypse (cc. 24–27) as the first Biblical pseudepigraph, "put out" under Isaiah's name (here designated "Pseudo-Isaiah", a term to be avoided for the same reason as "fabricated apocalyptic"!). There is of course a sense in which any work done by a disciple in a tradition-circle is pseudonymous, but it has to be distinguished decisively from the *designed* pseudonymity of the kind we encounter in Daniel and Enoch.

Despite the slow growth over many centuries thus far described, Dr Frost finds Apocalyptic "precipitated" by the threat of Hellenization from the end of the third century. "In that all-pervading atmosphere of Hellenism, the Jew was taken with a sense of claustrophobia and panicked into apocalyptic"! The striking innovation in the third century is the new teaching of a resurrection of the dead, springing from Chaldean sources, present both in the left-wing popular production, 1 Enoch, and in the right-wing Pseudo-Isaiah and Daniel. The Dream-Visions of Enoch (Book IV) represent Apocalyptic artistically complete. After that, decline. Here we note only the author's interesting attempt to discern in Daniel the spiritual history of a Jew who found in Apocalyptic the answer to his nation's need in face of the persecution of Antiochus. The increasing apocalyptic interest of the later chapters suggests a story of conversion. The chapters are some-

what rearranged on the basis of the amount of apocalyptic interest, to support the theory. If on the other hand you leave the chapters as they are, then you suppose that this Jew "flirted with the new unorthodoxy" with a resultant ebb and flow of interest. The change of language (from Aramaic to Hebrew) is explained by his conversion. To the converted apocalyptist, the holy language of the prophets seemed the appropriate vehicle of his thought. Few will keep pace with Dr Frost as he races ahead of the evidence. (He can even detect when this Jew was "not yet converted, yet nevertheless ripe for conversion"!) Moreover it is surely once again to misunderstand the nature of the language used to assert confidently that the author of Daniel expected the eschaton within his own day. We still do not really know what he meant by "at the time of the end".

Although there is so much material for disagreement, many will be grateful for a manful attempt at synthesis on a large scale such as is not often undertaken.

Misprints have been noticed on pp. 25, 31, 39, 46, 183, 241. The Christian name of Mowinckel and the initials of Cooke (once) and Albright are wrongly given.

DURHAM. D. R. JONES.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JEREMY TAYLOR. By C. J. Stranks. S.P.C.K. For the Church Historical Society. 25s.

Canon Stranks has made a notable contribution towards a satisfactory reconstruction of Jeremy Taylor's life, not so much by bringing to light new material as by throwing new light at many points upon the old. Each work is attractively and objectively introduced in the setting of Taylor's life and times.

Of the new material, Canon Stranks has perhaps revealed too little of Taylor's correspondence with Conway in the Murray MSS, leaving a careful collection of all Taylor's correspondence, including unnoticed letters in the Carte MSS, much to be desired. Of the old, Canon Stranks by a more accurate use of Patrick Adair's *True Narrative* has gone far to correct the dismal picture Gosse painted half a century ago of Taylor's last seven years as a lonely, disappointed, persecuting bishop; but he has hardly used this contemporary source extensively enough to elucidate properly the bitter struggle in Ulster between Anglicans and Presbyterians. Adair gives the key to the situation in drawing attention to the Irish metropolitical machinery in describing a dispute between Taylor's successor and James Margetson, Archbishop of Armagh (1663–78), before the triennial visitation of 1670. "That being the year of the Archbishop's visitation", he explains, "inferior bishops were not to meddle with jurisdiction but by his appointment" (op. cit., 298). That was exactly the position of Taylor during the prohibited period (much longer in the seventeenth than later centuries) before the triennial metropolitical visitations of 1661, 1664, and 1667. He had in turn to adapt himself to Bramhall's vigorous policy of 1661 and to Margetson's policy of appeasement in

1664 and 1667. Adair and afterwards Mant, Reid, and Killen, imply that Bramhall's policy regarding the ordination of Presbyterian ministers and displacement of those who would not qualify thereby was provincial. Adair gives a black list of nine ministers (not quite as complete as Reid claims) who qualified "by embracing the snare laid before them" of episcopal ordination: two in the diocese of Derry, one in Raphoe, two in Bramhall's, and four in Taylor's (ibid., 262). Although displacements of the disqualified took place in every Ulster diocese, including Bramhall's, they were more keenly felt in the dioceses of Down and Connor and of Derry, "where the throng of such ministers principally were" (ibid., 247). Dr Dudley Loftus, who as Vicar-General took part in the metropolitical visitation of 1661 and had more direct knowledge of it than John Vesey, who did not, states that Bramhall concluded all the affairs of the dioceses of his province *ad normam suae Dioceseos, prout rati postulabat, et jubebat aequitae* (*Oratio Funebris* . . . 28). This inside information should check a tendency to attribute to Taylor alone what was in fact a desperate struggle for the very continuance of the Anglican Communion where to-day it is strong and vigorous in the dioceses of Armagh, Clogher, Raphoe, Derry, as well as in Down and Connor and Dromore.

Among technical points regarding Taylor's writings the following may require reconsideration. With Eden Canon Stranks assigns to "Pseudo-Tayloriana" (p. 301) *The Psalter, or Psalms of David* (which in spite of his marginal note is included in Heber's edition of Taylor: Vol. XV, xcv–cx, 111–96), without noticing *Devotions for the Help and Assistance of all Christian People* (ibid. 197–235), inseparably bound up with it from the first edition of 1644, where we meet with overwhelming evidence of Taylor's style. With Gosse Canon Stranks has rather obscured the facts, clearly given by W. J. Brown, about the manuscript letter known since 1848 by J. Barrow's (not Taylor's) title, *On the Reverence due to the Altar*. In spite of Gosse, it was outside Oxford at the death in 1691 of Bishop Thomas Barlow, who bequeathed it with similar tracts to the Library of Queen's College, Oxford (MS 217), where Barrow noticed it accidentally, having first read of Taylor's neat handwriting in R. A. Willmott's *Life . . . of Taylor* of 1847. Why then does Canon Stranks say (p. 276) that this manuscript was "discovered early in the nineteenth century" and that it "does not bear Taylor's signature" which Barrow thought could be traced through an erasure? Barrow's case for a date c. 1637 surely needs re-examination. It rests mainly on a comparison with Taylor's autographs at different dates, the only early handwriting examined being the Uppingham entries (1637–42) and one letter of 1642. An expert on handwriting should be called in. Meanwhile the opening paragraph and other internal evidence make it difficult to go on supposing that this letter was written by a young man of twenty-four. Canon Stranks wisely refers to Taylor's chief passages on the Eucharist (p. 137, where unfortunate printing transpositions distort the marginal references) without looking for periods in his teaching. Canon Stranks suggests that the *Dicourse of Con-*

firmation (1663) "shows many signs of having been put together from previously existing papers" and that the sermons he had given at his confirmations "would provide some of the necessary material when he came to consider writing a book" (p. 253). But internal evidence and the circumstances of the publication of the first Dublin edition imply that this work was commissioned by the Irish House of Bishops and completed before the autumn of 1662 and before Taylor could reasonably have accumulated Confirmation sermons, more often until recent times delegated to priests. He had covered some of the ground in *Episcopacy Asserted* and in two sermons "Of the Spirit of Grace", but he may have had access to two discourses of Confirmation no longer extant: Bramhall's which he knew and praised (*Works*, VIII, 418) and Ussher's "concerning the antiquity and good use of it" (N. Bernard, *Clavi Trabalis*, 63). Taylor nowhere mentions Ussher by name nor profits from his important conclusions on the Ignatian writings or the Creeds, but he gives the impression of having used Ussher's *Answer to a Jesuit in Ireland* (1625) as a quarry for parts of *The Real Presence . . .* and of *The Dissuasive from Popery*, particularly in the sections of Parts I and II on Purgatory.

But taking all in all Canon Stranks has performed a great service, and his book should open for many the door to a rich treasure house.

East Markham. F. R. Bolton.

The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Gollancz. 15s.

The World of Silence. By Max Picard. Harvill Press. 12s. 6d.

Both these books are the fruit of a life-time's reflection and both echo voices of modern prophecy for the contemporary world. They also provide a contrast. Berdyaev's is a composite volume, compiled from his last, incomplete manuscripts and given to the public posthumously by four Parisian disciples: Picard's is a writer's finished work. The one appears to work outward, thrusting into the kaleidoscope of modern life until we nearly lose sight of the argument: the other steadily gathers the variety and absorbs it into the strength of a single theme. The Russian relies on individual sentences to enlighten the reader: the German on the total impact of his subject.

Followers of Berdyaev will here find, as his words admit in phrases like "as I have frequently said", many observations which are already familiar from earlier books. Newcomers to his thinking will regret that the cross-references are not given so that these could be explored. But all who read this "spiritual last will and testament" will be deeply impressed by its vigour and freshness.

The opening essay, styled "a gnosseological introduction", on "the Struggle for the Truth" repeats the writer's disavowal of what are known in the West as traditional doctrines, but the body of the book is strong in affirmations which are fed by these doctrines. Anguish is ours; and contradictions "of freedom", "in Marxism", in life generally, breed our own obscurities. "Ours is a trying and difficult period, one in which the joy of living seems to be diminished." But our

basic dilemmas, accentuated by "the technical age", are not confined to our own time. Man is related to God, nature, and society. In his "divided and lost condition he is in slavery to the last two, but freedom awaits him", and "man's freedom lies in this, that he belongs to two planes of being: that of the spirit and that of Caesar". In this setting, amongst the most creative of Berdyaev's insights is his teaching on the nature of revolution, which can be assembled from various passages:

> "In the deeper sense of the word, revolution, if it is not merely a change of coats, as too often is the case, is a complete, integral change of man and of human society."
>
> "We may speak of the new technical man, of the Fascist man, of the Soviet, or the communist man. We even hear expressions like the catholic or the protestant man, the Renaissance or the romantic man. You may give a host of names to new types of men, but man himself changes less than would seem to be the case from his appearance and his gestures: often he has only changed his clothes, putting on in one period a revolutionary suit, in another the costume of a reactionary."

Revolutionaries are undermined by their contact with that against which they are in revolt, and the failure of revolutions to achieve their aims is "connected with the problems of time, with the view of the present, not as an end in itself, but as a means to the future, such a future as never will arrive". Real release for man comes and is perceived in terms not of progress but of eschatology.

The clear-cut epigrams together with the blurred tensions in the book add pathos to a last pointer, which must qualify any verdict which future generations will pass on the message of Nicolas Berdyaev: "here we approach the final sphere of the mystic, to which I hope to devote a separate book."

Max Picard, author of *The Last Man, Hitler and Ourselves*, and *The Flight from God*, has now pitched on another theme whose urgency is indisputable. His subject is always with us, and its grandeur is matched by his treatment of it. In modern sophistry this has been vulgarized to the measurements of strictures on words, radio, machinery, and the like, all of which tend to be as noisy as the noise which they deplore. Picard has prudently postponed what he has to say under these heads to the latter part of his book, where they are duly subordinated. He begins:

> "Silence is not simply what happens when we stop talking. . . . When language ceases silence begins. But it does not begin *because* language ceases. The absence of language simply makes the presence of silence more apparent."

Silence is positive, a basic phenomenon, "like love and loyalty and death and life itself". Creation and the Incarnation—of "the Word" —both come forth from silence. "The contiguity of silence and speech" could only have been achieved "by an act of God himself".

We cannot claim that Picard has enunciated a theology of silence, but he states some of its presuppositions. In this his book invites comparison with a chapter in Dr Geddes MacGregor's recent study of *Christian Doubt*, where there are discernible the beginnings of a

theological statement without such presuppositions. Picard relies upon the evidence of reason as a prelude to that of revelation. He recognizes the revelation of silence through reason in poetry, painting, architecture, childhood, age. His examples are pregnant, setting English readers a fruitful exercise in interpretation, for (with the exception of Shakespeare) the samples of silence in the arts which he selects do not belong to our island. Can our own traditions yield parallel illustrations? If we are barren in this, can it be attributed to an indigenous dislike or denial of silence? Further, is this due to a native weakness in the mystical trait?

This book deserves to be often in the hands of pastors and preachers who are ready to enter humbly into its depth. Perhaps it could bring back reality to the almost threadbare routine of introducing "silence for a space" into public worship. It might clothe with wonder preaching. It would certainly revive within the reader awareness of the numinous, for, as Gabriel Marcel in his discriminating preface to the book observes, its lesson is that "in approaching God, man approaches the silence with which God himself is surrounded". Picard's own conclusion repeats famous words of Kierkegaard: "The present state of the world and the whole of life is diseased. If I were a doctor and were asked for my advice, I should reply: Create silence! Bring men to silence."

W. W. S. March.

Goring-by-Sea.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Prophecy. By Willy Kramp. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

This short book has in many respects more the character of an epic poem than a prose novel. The author is concerned to present a rapid series of situations, some of dangerous adventure, some of the emotions alone, and in them to study human reactions in the too often inhuman setting of prison camp and Russian partisan warfare. With a fine disregard for the modern reader's desire for the careful logic of events and a happy ending, Willy Kramp carries his story beyond the reach of "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life". In fact he writes a religious book, although, except for one quotation from the opening of St John's Gospel by a cobbler of mysterious character, there is no consciously religious situation. The slight figure of the cobbler in the prison camp has in him some of the mystery of Eliot's Unidentified Guest in *The Cocktail Party*, and he literally has the last word in the book.

The bare bones of living in a Russian camp for German P.O.W.s after 1945 was so tenuously connected with what would commonly be called real life that it gives full and terrible opportunity for the insufficiency of worldly hope to be shown as a pitiful miasma. Willy Kramp begins and breaks off human chronicles abruptly and without

apology. But by doing this he avoids the pitfalls of preaching a faith that may be thought synonymous with human joy. When all worldly hope and joy are in doubt, he manages to suggest a religious philosophy of the Resurrection from the fragments of spiritual things which men in every situation may see.

This is not a great book, it is too slight for that adjective. It is well written and well translated, but not worthy of more than a "satis" in this respect. However, the S.C.M. Press are to be warmly congratulated for their discernment in publishing a book which belongs so essentially to our peculiar age, to our Europe, to our common understanding of life, and yet is so deeply impregnated with the faith which must transcend those things.

PUSAN, KOREA. PAUL BURROUGH.

THE RULE OF ST BENEDICT. By Justin McCann, O.S.B. Burns Oates. 16s.

It is a relief to find that this is not yet another book about St Benedict, but the text in Latin and English of the Benedictine Rule: the first of a series of reprints, carefully revised, of the pre-war Orchard Series. The publishers claim that "the separate titles of the old series are being reset in a larger and more attractive format". Certainly the layout of the type is admirable, though many will still prefer the handy pocket size of the old series.

Abbot McCann states that his purpose is "to provide an edition of the Rule which shall be of service both to the monk in choir and to the general reader". He modestly disclaims that he is producing a critical edition, though he is clearly competent to do so. His text is based on the Authentic Text with modifications in respect of Vulgarisms and Orthography in the interest of the general reader and the recitation of the Rule in choir. To facilitate the latter, the Rule is divided into sections with the appropriate dates inserted into the margin, when that section is read. It would have been an advantage if the title headings announced by the Lector had also been listed somewhere, as there are six variations (e.g. Incipit Prologus. . . . Ex Prologo. . . . Incipit Regula, etc.).

For the general reader, however, the Preface, giving an account of the evolution of the various texts, is both interesting and easy to follow. The footnotes are restrained and the notes at the end can be read with profit. We think, however, Abbot McCann is over tender to the feelings of the classical scholar, who is seldom to be found in the category of general reader these days.

In our opinion the English Translation is an improvement on the one published in the Pax series by S.P.C.K. in 1931, which was based on Dom Cuthbert Butler's emendations to the Textus Receptus. Abbot McCann has the advantage of the findings of more recent scholarship.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS. B. M. OMAN.

Saints for Now. Edited by Clare Boothe Luce. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

St Benedict Joseph Labre. By Agnes de la Gorce. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

Good hagiography demands of its author both historical skill and a degree of sanctity. There are signs of this happy combination in both these books, but both are marred here and there by suggestions that the saints' real task is to turn men's hearts to Rome.

Mrs Luce can hardly be blamed for this defect in her book. Her eighteen contributors are not exclusively Roman Catholics; and her own introductory essay on Saints and their diversity is admirable; though I cannot agree either that "The saints *always* saw their appointed task as the *imitation* of Christ" (p. 2) or that Thomism has lasted "five hundred centuries" (p. 6).

Most of the essays make pleasant and instructive reading: three do not; Alfred Noyes' emotional and cock-sure essay on St John; Rebecca West's sketch of St Augustine, which reveals nothing of his intellect, nothing of his mysticism, and which is loaded with sweeping generalizations; and D. B. Wyndham Lewis' portrait of Pius V as a theistic version of Nietzsche's Superman.

Thomas Merton's essay excels, because he really knows his saint—John of the Cross, whom he describes as "the most accessible of saints" and yet "not everybody's food". The reason for this, as Fr Merton explains, is that we understand and love him only "in the depths of prayer".

There are six attractive drawings of Saints.

The second book is about a beggar, Benedict Joseph Labre, born in 1748, the eldest son of a French peasant family. Terrifyingly austere from his childhood days, his life's ambition was to become a Trappist. From his twenty-third year till his death in 1783 he lived as a beggar-pilgrim, travelling from shrine to shrine, ever hoping to prove his monastic vocation.

But it is the inner journey of this spiritual son of St Francis that matters. Agnes de la Gorce shows us an ascetic, whose mortifications began with shrinking from the comfort of the hearth and ended in welcoming the vermin which throve on his emaciated body, a mystic, whose passionate love of God began in fear and torment and ended in trust and hope, a victim treading the Way of the Cross.

The book is marred by the occasional misguided comment—e.g. (p. 86) "[Benedict] confessed that he had never loved God enough. All the evil in the world is less mysterious that [presumably for *than*] this depth of purity."

St Albans. Peter Graham.

Theology and Evolution. Edited by E. C. Messenger. Sands and Co. 21s.

This book illustrates with much documentation the extreme conservatism of the Roman Church on a scientific subject that carries

theological implications. Such conservatism may, however, be regarded in very different lights. It is now almost a hundred years since *The Origin of Species* was published: are we to say the Roman Church has behaved with commendable caution in treating so dangerous a doctrine as that of evolution with such reserve? Or are we to condemn it for an extravagant attachment to obsolete ideas, such as is likely to drive thinking individuals out into the agnostic wilderness? The problem of the Church's policy towards new scientific ideas is one of extreme importance in our time, particularly with the advance of the social sciences. It is one aspect of the bigger problem of the reassessment of the deliverances of tradition (moral as well as theological, political as well as metaphysical) in the light of changing circumstances—never in any society, however simple, an easy matter, but now complicated almost beyond belief.

The first half of the book under review consists of reviews of a previous work by Dr Messenger, *Evolution and Theology*, published in 1931, together with replies to the various criticisms. This part is likely to be tedious to the average reader; but if the cumbersome intellectual machinery (better than none?) of his Church is granted, the need for this kind of compilation must also be allowed. The critical question is that of the origin of man, and the forty-page chapter summarizing the contending arguments, both scientific and theological, is admirably lucid and balanced.

The second half of the book discusses the question of the origin of the soul in the individual human being. Dr Messenger argues powerfully in favour of the Mediate Animation theory. He points out that before the human embryo is about two months old it is "as yet without the high degree of animal life called for by the human species, which needs a well-developed nervous system and brain", and infers that a rational soul which is the "form" of the body is not likely to be infused into the body before this time. It is interesting to note that Aquinas supports the Mediate Animation theory, and that his argument rests partly on his emphatic rejection of a dualistic interpretation of the relation between body and soul. One is tempted again to speculate whether the criticism of Cartesian dualism by Prof. Ryle and his school will clear the way for a fresh resurgence of Thomism.

K. G. Collier.

Exeter.

Daily Life in the Early Church. Studies in the Church Social History of the First Five Centuries. By J. G. Davies. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

This book, for all its unpretentiousness and reserve in communicating scholarly knowledge, breaks new ground. The author has written six illuminating essays in early Christian social history, of a pattern similar to that of the late Eileen Power in her *Medieval People*. The total result is highly successful, and Mr Davies creates a vivid picture of the way in which typical Christians lived and thought in the early centuries. Clement of Alexandria, whose writings are

packed with material for the social historian, is portrayed in the first chapter, taking family prayers with his wife and children or lecturing at the Catechetical School. Paul of Samosata is taken as a type of the worldly prelate for whose existence in the third century eloquent testimony could be found in the scathing complaints of Origen or in the unscrupulous lying of Pope Cornelius' letter to Fabius of Antioch. But is it quite fair to put Paul in this class? On rising from his bed, did he really "contemplate moodily the figure of the young woman who has been sharing his couch", or gaze at a picture of Aphrodite above his bed (p. 45)? After all, the bishops who condemned him (with so little success) in 268 were bitterly hostile Origenists whose portrait of this trenchant critic of Origen may be more than a little malicious. Mr Davies' second chapter leaves me, I confess, slightly disquieted at his exaltation of the "imaginative and literary elements" in historical writing—perhaps at the expense of the scientific (pp. 169 ff.). It is not, however, to be denied that the chapter on Paul makes lively reading.

More satisfactory are the studies of Victoria, a martyr of Carthage, where the material is mainly drawn from the Donatist Acts of the martyrs of Abitina, and of Diogenes, a sexton of Rome, where the author's archaeological interests come to the fore. The latter is particularly well done. St John Chrysostom is an obvious choice for a social historian, and the complexities of his life as Archbishop of Constantinople are excellently depicted. Lastly we have a picture of life in the monastery of St Victor under St John Cassian, where the author writes with simplicity and sympathy of the ascetic life.

The book is marked by many imaginative touches which make it delightful bedside reading. And the six studies are presented with an economy of learned apparatus which may be the envy of patristic students.

H. Chadwick.

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

Receive the Joyfulness of Your Glory. By Maisie Spens. With 10 photo plates. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

To communicate the inexpressible is the age-old problem of all spiritual writers. In her latest book Miss Spens has succeeded to a quite remarkable extent in solving the problem.

Structurally the book consists of twelve loosely co-ordinated sections, each of a distinctively different literary type, all illustrating and enlarging upon the single theme of the Glory of God, "the totality of divine attributes in their intrinsic and plenary perfection". To be partakers of this Glory, to enter into the very perfection of the Godhead, is the purpose of all creation and the calling of every individual. What this involves is, for Miss Spens, revealed supremely in the Transfiguration of our Lord, where the One through whom all things must be transfigured is seen in the eternal, silent unity of divine Glory, yet indefeasibly identified with the created order.

All who seriously attempt to pray will be grateful to the author for sharing with us her profound knowledge of the contemplative way of prayer. Nevertheless her demand for the recognition of the Transfiguration as of unique and paramount significance seems itself to bar the road to the highest achievement of the Unitive Way.

The omission of the Transfiguration from the Fourth Gospel (a matter ignored by Miss Spens) is surely an indication that it is the whole Incarnate Life which must be seen *sub specie aeternitatis*, whilst the weight of glory, for John as for Paul, remains upon the Cross. To focus one's spiritual apprehension elsewhere is to risk precisely that individualism of doctrine which the spiritual masters unanimously reject.

From this individualism, no doubt, springs the otherwise puzzling eclecticism of much of the material of this book. The expositions of Orthodox spirituality as expressed in icons and frescoes are deeply evocative, but the treatment of the Immaculate Conception introduces a disintegrating element in Anglican theology.

Miss Spens tends frankly to the exotic, and frequently fails to see that the essence of the devotional material of the saints has been its "ordinariness" and its immediacy. Her own material becomes increasingly dramatic throughout, with a consequent decline in real spiritual significance. This is the most disappointing feature of a nevertheless striking and unusually penetrating book.

HUCKNALL. E. W. TRUEMAN DICKEN.

MORAL PROBLEMS. Questions on Christianity, with answers by prominent churchmen. Mowbray. 5s.

This collection of answers to questions about morality was prepared and published for the mission to the Royal Air Force in November, 1952, but as most of the questions are of general interest and of frequent occurrence it was reasonably considered that the book would be of wider use. There is an impressive team of contributors, clerical and lay. Not all the answers to the questions are equally impressive, but taken as a whole they convey much wholesome enlightenment in short compass.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABBEY PRESS (ABINGDON): K. E. Kirk, *The Story of the Woodard Schools* [Illustrated] (6s.).

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: Lynn Harold Hough, *Great Humanists* ($3.50).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Christopher Isherwood (Ed.), *Vedanta for Modern Man* (25s.); R. F. A. Hoernlé, *Studies in Philosophy* (30s.); T. M. Forsyth, *God and the World* (10s. 6d.); John R. Everett, *Religion in Human Experience* (30s.).

AUBIER ÉDITIONS (MONTAIGNE, PARIS): Geddes MacGregor, *Les Frontières de la Morale et de la Religion* (n.p.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: A. H. Armstrong, *The Greek Philosophical Background of the Psychology of St Thomas* (1s. 6d.); Gerald Vann, O.P., *The Wisdom of Boethius* (1s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. H. Connolly, *The Explanatio Symboli ad Initiandos: A Work of Saint Ambrose* (16s.); C. F. D. Moule, *The Language of the New Testament* [Inaugural lecture] (2s. 6d.).

CASTERMAN (TOURNAI): *Tolerance et Communanté humaine: Chrétiens dans un monde divisé* (84 frs.); F. M. Braun, *La Mère des Fidèles: essai de théologie johannique* (84 frs.).

CLARENDON PRESS: Ian T. Ramsey, *Miracles* [Inaugural lecture] (2s. 6d.); Helen Gardner (Ed.), *John Donne: The Divine Poems* (25s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: E. Gordon Rupp, *Principalities and Powers* (7s. 6d.).

FAITH PRESS: Reginald Lumb, *The Education of Souls* [A scheme of education built around the sacraments] (6s.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: C. E. Raven, *The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism* (5s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: G. C. Blackman, *The Faith We Preach* [For lay preachers and others] (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: A. D. POWER, *Ecclesiastes* [A new translation with introduction and notes] (8s. 6d.); Roland Oliver, *The Missionary Factor* (17s. 6d cloth; 12s. 6d. paper).

MOWBRAY: Philip Loyd, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts* [Devotional Study of Acts 1–12] (5s.); Francis C. Eeles, *The Coronation Service* [An historical and liturgical commentary for the general reader] (7s. 6d.); Bishop of London, Dean of St Paul's, V. A. Demant, Lindsay Dewar, *Christian Belief of To-day* [Diocesan lectures during the School of Religion in London, Lent, 1952] (15s.); S. P. T. Prideaux, *More Outline Sermons on General Subjects* (3s. 6.).

JOHN MURRAY: Edith B. Schnapper, *One in All* (7s.).

NEWMAN BOOKSHOP (OXFORD): *Christ in Dachau* (3s.).

NISBET: Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Irony of American History* (15s.); C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (10s. 6d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: D. S. Bailey, *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church of England* (15s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Geoffrey Parrinder, *Religion in an African City* (15s.); John G. Auton and Patrick Wild, *Music at the Parish Church* [A practical guide for organists and choirmasters] (6s.); T. S. Garrett, *The Liturgy of the Church of South India: an introduction to and commentary on "The Service of the Lord's Supper"* (3s. 6d.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: *Conflicts of Loyalties?* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *The Challenge of Communism* [Report of a Church of Scotland commission] (4s.); *The Church under Communism* [Report of a Church of Scotland commission] (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: *A Year with Father Briscoe of Bagborough* [An anthology of Fr Briscoe's teaching, mostly not previously published] (15s.); *The Church of England and the Churches of Norway, Denmark and Iceland* [Report of the committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1951] (4s. 6d.); R. H. Ward, *The Prodigal Son* [Revised edition of a verse play based on the parable] (3s.); H. E. W. Turner, *Why We Believe in Jesus Christ* [for Christian discussion groups] (2s. 6d.); A. M. Mackenzie, *Rival Establishments in Scotland, 1560–1690* (4s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND THE NATIONAL SOCIETY: John G. Williams, *Leading School Worship* (1s. 3d.).

WESTMINSTER PRESS: Floyd V. Filson, *Opening the New Testament* [A popular introduction] ($2.50); D. R. G. Owen, *Scientism, Man, and Religion* ($3.50).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher